

1445  
Tarn. misc.

# **"American Catholic"**

## **A BRIEF CRITIQUE**



*By*

**CHARLES HENRY BABCOCK, D.D**

*Contributing Editor of "The Chronicle"*



**PUBLISHED BY  
THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SOCIETY  
FOR THE  
PROMOTION OF EVANGELICAL KNOWLEDGE**

**1913**





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2019 with funding from  
Columbia University Libraries





# “American Catholic”

## A BRIEF CRITIQUE

---



*By*

CHARLES HENRY BABCOCK, D.D

*Contributing Editor of “The Chronicle”*



---

PUBLISHED BY  
THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SOCIETY  
FOR THE  
PROMOTION OF EVANGELICAL KNOWLEDGE

1913



# THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL EDUCATIONAL SERIES

ALREADY ISSUED:

## I. PROTESTANTISM

By LEIGHTON PARKS, D.D.,  
Rector of St. Bartholomew's Church, New  
York.

## II. THE ATTITUDE OF PRAYER-BOOK CHURCHMEN TOWARDS THE LATEST AT- TEMPT TO CHANGE THE NAME OF THE CHURCH.

By RANDOLPH H. MCKIM, D.D., LL.D.,  
D.C.L., Rector of the Church of the Epiphany,  
Washington, D. C.

## III. SPIRITUAL RENAISSANCE: AN ESSAY IN PROTESTANTISM

By CHARLES HENRY BABCOCK, D.D.,  
General Chairman of the Church Congress (of  
the Protestant Episcopal Church) in the  
United States.

## IV. "PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL:" A PLEA FOR THE CONSTITUTIONAL STUDY OF THE CHURCH'S NAME

By HENRY S. NASH, D.D.,  
Professor, Episcopal Theological School, Cam-  
bridge, Mass.

V. PROTESTANTISM AND DEMOCRACY: A  
PRESENT DAY PROBLEM

By LEIGHTON PARKS, D.D.,

Rector of St. Bartholomew's Church, New  
York.

VI. THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH—A QUEST

By JOHN G. BACCHUS, D.D.,

Rector of the Church of the Incarnation,  
Brooklyn, N. Y.

VII. "AMERICAN CATHOLIC:" A BRIEF  
CRITIQUE

By CHARLES HENRY BABCOCK, D.D.,

General Chairman of the Church Congress in  
the United States.

Contributing Editor of "The Chronicle."



## I.

### “AMERICAN CATHOLIC.”\*

When, as now, it has been definitely proposed to erase “Protestant Episcopal” from the ‘scutcheon of this church in order to write “American Catholic” in its place it is natural for us to seek to know the value of the proposed new name. We, therefore, address ourselves to a short and easy consideration of the possible profit, or loss, involved in this change of name which we are, with such calm assurance, invited to make. Incidentally we will point to some historical and to some liturgical facts of permanent significance and of present use to us in the handling of our subject.

First, as to “Catholic”—what is it ecclesiastically today but a word which has lost all meaning save that which designates the Roman Catholic Church? It had great meaning once—this term so aged,—but it has been emptied of that meaning, now many a day. Indeed, the word has had divers and sundry meanings during its long existence,—which of them, we ask, except the one already mentioned, really now survives? What *sort* of Catholic, then, is intended by the proposers of the new name? Are we to take the Word in its earliest sense, as meaning all the baptized *everywhere*, as distinguished from the disciples in some particular locality, say Antioch or Jerusalem? Or, are we to understand by it the later connotation,

---

\* The substance of these brief essays appeared as editorials in the “Chronicle” magazine during 1912-13. C. H. B.

of all who hold "the correct opinion" in theology? Or, are we to take it, in the still later sense, of those who submit to Papal authority; or, in the sense of the adherents of the Oxford Movement, or, with the meaning of the Boston-Milwaukee-California school of catholicity in our own time and country? These are reasonable questions. If we are to be "Catholic" we surely must know of what *sort*, and the varieties of Catholicism rival in number the various Protestant "sects" upon which so much "Catholic" vituperation has been expended. And then, in connection with this, as to "American,"—what is meant by that? Is the word here to convey to our minds North, or South or Central American? Names, we should remember, are signs of things and when we are requested to be "American Catholic" it is in good order to inquire what sort of thing that is. We are suspicious that the brand of Catholic for the most part existing in Central or in South America and parts adjacent would not blend with the proposed Protestant Episcopal variety without considerable resultant discoloration and effervescence.

As a matter of fact "American Catholic" is a contradiction in terms, as if one should say a "Local Universal," or a "Partial Whole." The proposal of it as a substitute for the name of the Protestant Episcopal Church may provoke an indulgent and deferential smile, due to the ancient atmosphere in which it was generated, but surely it is not to be very seriously taken by any modern body alive to the fitness of things.

One of the irrefragable truths which ultimately dominate church and state is that "youth will be served," which may be also rendered "the world moves on!"

The world moved on in due time to Protestantism and the measure of its progress was seen in the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The impetus of that stupendous and splendid movement is far from being spent and its destination has not yet been reached. The dream-children of the Middle Ages born in our day cannot be expected to appreciate the value of the trend of the world's young, vigorous, religious life of these glorious and entrancing times. It would be too much to demand of such that they accept with eager alacrity Protestantism with all the priceless modernity with which it is bound up and of which it is a vital part. Their religious convictions are for the most part rooted in times agone and dim with distance. That distance, somehow, does not lend enchantment to our view of many of the religious sentiments and practices of which it vouchsafes us a partial revelation. Are we to permit any man or any number of men to bring out of that dim distance Catholic, the old, and compel us to wed it to American, the young, for the institution of a new family of heaven on earth? Aside from the absurdity of the family name—"American Catholic,"—which would be thus perpetrated, there is an incongruity of age and origin which protests loud and long against such an unnatural marriage. Before any man or any number of men can do that thing and bind us to it, they must create a condition of things suited to their purpose. They must secure consent to repudiate the modern and adopt the ancient, as, for example, abandon the railway for the post coach, and the steamship for the slave-rowed galley; legislate out of existence all modern means of locomotion; extinguish the

electric lights and return to candles; smash machinery in all its uses and revert to hand labor exclusively; banish the Copernican, and re-establish the Ptolemaic, astronomy and do a lot of things equally preposterous and injurious to human life. Let it all go together,—this odious Protestantism, and when 'tis gone, the fitness of things will countenance the proposed wedding of the aged and the youthful by the adoption of “American Catholic” as a substitute for the present and the eminently appropriate name of our Church. But let us congratulate our selves that such a condition of things is not yet, and probably will never come to be. As the late Bishop of Connecticut used sometimes comically to say, when considering something which seemed ludicrously impossible, so we in the present case may exclaim, “Non tempus uno,” and adopt the good Bishop’s translation, “Nary time once”!

## II.

WE read in the Acts of the Apostles that “the disciples were called Christians *first* in Antioch.” And as we read we muse and wonder if future generations will somewhere find it recorded that the disciples were called Christians *last* by a certain sect within the Protestant Episcopal Church, which substituted “Catholics” for “Christians” when speaking of themselves in the Church of Christ. The wonder is not without color of justification in view of the present vogue of this word “Catholic.” The minds of Churchmen and others have been assiduously sown with it for long and the



verbal harvest from that sowing is now abundant. We have, springing up on every side the plainest evidences of this. There is a rich multiplicity of things "Catholic" by name. We have pressed upon us catholic views, catholic practices, catholic dogma, catholic interpretations, catholic usages, catholic vestments, catholic statesmen, catholic aspirations and—to go no further—even catholic Congregationalists, which last are quite as paradoxical as the would-be "American Catholics" in the Protestant Episcopal Church. What does it all mean? It means, if we may venture to say so, that a new fashion ecclesiastical has come to town. This new style changes quite marvellously the appearance of those who adopt it. The "disciples in Antioch" plainly habited as mere "Christians" would hardly be recognized in our kaleidoscopic catholicity as learners in the school of Jesus Christ. The word Christian seems in some danger, at any rate, of extinction—of being lost from the lips of men. "Christian" is apparently very much out of date and behind the times with our ecclesiastical fashionables. Derived as it is from the Master's most significant title and having, moreover, the sanction of remote antiquity,—it is nevertheless being set aside in favor of this word "Catholic," the present day significance of which is so difficult to ascertain. We wonder at the seeming attractiveness of the latter word. It is reasonable to suppose that it came into churchly being as a colloquialism. It must have been used casually in conversation. When people in the earliest Christian times, wanted to speak of the Church "on the whole" they said, "Catholic" and every

listening body knew what was meant. From employment in that easy way it would naturally acquire a sort of "Use" which would gradually bring it into literature and it would in consequence harden into a technical term. Thus used it was before very long applied to indicate, not only the "whole" church, but the "whole" orthodox or "correct" teaching as well. But so far as authoritative official sanction is concerned "Catholic" was rather late in getting it. The word did not appear at all in the Creed of the Council of Nice (A. D. 325) but was added to the Nicene Creed at the Council of Constantinople (A. D. 381). It was first inserted in the so-called Apostles' Creed in the fifth century (A. D. 452) by Nicetas, bishop of Aquileia—a pretty far cry from the birthtime of Christianity! The word thus belated in recognition officially by the Church seems to have been one of those almost fortuitous ones which sometimes creep into language and presently acquire an importance to which they are not intrinsically entitled. It emitted its greatest glory in the shadowy Middle Ages when the "organic unity" of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church made possible (let us not forget it!) the most iniquitous ecclesiastical tyranny the Christian world has known.

We observe that "Catholic" was not, and is not, essential to the Christian religion. Indeed, it is not essential to anything save one of the weaknesses of human nature, namely, a better-than-thou sort of spirit in matters churchly. *Why* a "better-than-thou" spirit on account of "Catholic," it is difficult to explain, but, notwithstanding, we have seen it in the flesh. And yet



to use this word without connecting it with some generic term to vitalize it is to express, in strictness, nothing at all. To say, "I am a Catholic" without adding "Christian," or some other interpretative expression, means merely, "I am on the whole," or "I am general," or "universal." Hence, as we have said, the word was never essential to Christianity but was merely descriptive of some aspects or conditions existing in the Church. Very different in kind is the name Christian applied in New Testament times to the disciples at Antioch. It may have been originally used as a derisive epithet by the enemies of the religion of the Risen One; but, nevertheless, adopted by His disciples it became the only really essential name for the followers of Jesus Christ. It is the generic term in relation to which all other descriptive titles are subservient or, it may be, antagonistic. It is the necessary antithesis of "heathen" or "pagan" while "Catholic" is not necessarily antithetical, or opposed, to either of them. Speaking hypercritically one might conceivably be a catholic heathen or a catholic pagan, for "Catholic," as we have intimated, is not generic but accidental or dependent on circumstances for signification. Of course, we know there are some who base the meaning of "Catholic" upon the famous dictum of a gentleman of the fifth century, known in history as Vincent of Lerins, who defined Catholics as those who hold and teach those and only those doctrines of the Church which have been believed "everywhere, always and by all." This at first blush seems plausible. But the insuperable obstacle to extracting clarity or comfort from this definition is that there are not, and never have been, any such doctrines.

There is not a dogma of the church or a teaching in Christendom which has not been stoutly controverted or utterly rejected sometime, by some Christians somewhere. If, therefore, we hold a brief for this Vincentian rule we can exploit it only by arguing in a vicious circle, which will land us in the conclusion that there are a number of doctrines which have been received in the Church "always and everywhere," by *all those who have always and everywhere* received them. This is doubtless satisfactory to the Vincentian type of mind and the rest of the world who "know not the law" are, also doubtless, cursed. It must not, however, be left unnoticed in connection with this that many men of high ability and reputation, to whom, for many reasons, we doff our hats in respect and admiration, have been led into the aforesaid Vincentian delusion by an o'erweening desire to share with the Church of Rome possession of the name "Catholic" altho' held in what they regard as a better because a more Christian sense. But do we really want to possess that word in our name at all?—a word lacking, as it is, in essentialness and exhibiting in its history only an arbitrary, or else an ambiguous, character. Would it bring us anything more than confusion on the one hand and derision on the other? Can we possibly have any use for it in our work in the time o' day in which we live and labor? We cannot perceive that we have, but, on the contrary, we are quite sure that we have not.

When, therefore, we are solicited by a fraction of our Church, obsessed with the antique, to denude ourselves of our good and comprehensive Name and reclothe ourselves in "American Catholic" we are shy—we hang

our heads in contemplation of the proposed new apparel as we modestly protest, "We would rather be excused, sirs, if you please," *especially as the identical title proposed* has been adopted and used by *Roman Catholics* in this country in describing the work of their Church in these United States!

### III.

CERTAIN names always bring to mind, in their use, certain other names associated with them historically or otherwise. This is a mere commonplace in psychology, but it has interest in connection with our present subject. Let us, for the sake of clearness, illustrate: When we hear some one say "Westminster Abbey" we at once recur to Edward the Confessor and not to him alone but, if we have a range of memories, to the great abbots and deans of Westminster and other celebrities as well. Or, if the name of Pickwick—unique creation of Charles Dickens' genius—occurs in conversation there troop along inevitably with that name in our minds Mrs. Bardell and Sergeant Buzzfuz and also the immortal Wellers, Tony and Sam. Similarly with other names, too numerous and quite unnecessary to mention, and conspicuous amongst them, for our purpose, is that well-worn and over-fondled name "catholic." At mention of it there rise to mental view St. Peter's and the Vatican and an endless procession of popes, councils, cardinals, inquisitors, priests and masses, but always and everywhere and above all, *priests*,—not only the officials but the function and the

fundamental notion of priesthood—are conjured up by association of ideas with “catholic.” We say “catholic” and immediately we think “priest.” If we are declared “catholics” it is taken for granted that we believe in priests, for “priest” is a cardinal note of “catholic.” And then believing in priests we believe in priestly sacrifices, for priests involve sacrifices and altars upon which to offer them and consequently priestly interventions between God and men. It seems quite superfluous to dwell upon this statement of facts. It is, to our thinking, as plain as unclouded sunrise that “catholic” and “priest” go together and also that “priest” means essentially a sacrificing official who in his palmiest days, either personally or by an assistant, cut the throat of the victim and used the blood that therefrom flowed as a sacrificial means to placate an offended deity.

Now, hard by the residence of priesthood there runs a line of cleavage in the Christian Church. Upon one side of that line are those who delight to be called “catholics” and who hold the theory that the Christian Ministry is a priesthood. That theory is known as Sacerdotalism and those who hold it are called sacerdotalists. They came to be historically what they are because Paganism and Judaism were what they were, outside of and before the Church. In other words Paganism and Judaism are responsible for the being of “priests” in Christendom. The infant Church of Christ was innocent of all such officials. There is no mention in the New Testament of such an one as having been created or accepted by Jesus Christ or as existing within the confines of Christianity. The great organizer



of the church, St. Paul, tells us that its officers, in his time and before, comprised apostles, prophets, teachers, helpers those gifted with healing and with languages, but he does not mention priests. There were also governmental or executive officials, namely, presbyters, deacons and presiding or over-seeing presbyters, otherwise called bishops, but again no priests. In short, nothing can be found in the earliest Christian writings providing, justifying or testifying to priests as ministrants or official residents in Christ's religion. On the contrary we find amongst those earliest writings the Epistle to the Hebrews in which familiar sacerdotal words are figuratively used to *comfort* the Hebrews addressed, under what they evidently regarded as their loss in the absolute and complete elimination of priesthood and sacrifice from religion, by the Divine Author of Christianity. Sacrifice and intercessory priests presenting vicarious victims are utterly lacking in the religion of Jesus, because He, in yielding His will to the will of the Father, satisfied all the demands of God for offerings, from His Son and from all His children, thenceforth and forever. When Christianity came in, priesthood went out and that it did not stay out was no fault of Christianity, which is Christ.

But when the infant Church went forth to win the world for Jesus and His service, it encountered priests on every hand, for they were deeply rooted in the religious soil of the world. Priests had had too long a tenure of religious office to readily relinquish it under the teachings of Christianity. It was of course against the interests of priests to have their order abolished and their caste destroyed. Their pecuniary prosperity

and powerful influence, as priests, involved too much of value to be surrendered. The pagan people, too, were wedded to the priestly institution. How could they give it up? It provided a bulwark between them and vindictive deities. It offered sacrifices to preserve them from afflictions and torments and losses, physical and spiritual. It came to them by inheritance from times afar and was associated with ancestral beliefs, customs and doings not easy to forget or to sully by apostasy. When, therefore, Christianity, priestless and unsacrificial, was presented for pagan acceptance it was not strange that many viewed it with head critically one-sided as they thought "what a curious and undesirable religion this must be"—without priests or altars or sacrifices or symbolized deities of any kind.

Christianity, engaged in its mission, preaching Jesus and eternal life, was taunted by pagans with being ridiculously destitute of priests and sacrifices and those taunts had, naturally some influence which in course of time produced deplorable changes in the ministry and worship of the church. The Jewish proselytes to Christianity also contributed to the same end. Judaism was, in a way, ancestral to Christianity. Its Scriptures, splendid in prophetic literature, but still shot through with sacrificial priestly teaching, constituted at first the only sacred books or Bible of the Christians. The pages of the Old Testament provided the early disciples of Jesus with nourishment for the sacerdotal idea when it was born, of Paganism, in the church. That idea, encouraged directly and indirectly by Jew and Pagan, anon gave token of quiescent and then of active life in the Christian Body; it grew a little and then it grew



apace and so, for the sake of ministering to Pagans, acceptably to themselves, and of adaptation to long established practices of the Hebrews, sacerdotalism insidiously, gradually, harmfully invaded Christianity until *in the third century* the process of corrupting pure Christianity with priesthood was pretty well advanced and *the fourth century* saw sacerdotalism firmly established in the church and bringing forth abundantly fruits after its kind. Amongst those fruits, early or late, were an ecclesiastical hierarchy assuming an unearthly dignity and “lording it over God’s heritage;” confession of sins and secrets in the ear of a priest intervening between God and penitent sinners; spiritual direction and control of a penitent’s life by the prescription of pains and penalties called penance; the constantly repeated miracle of the Mass, whereby the bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper were transubstantiated into the actual Body and Blood of Christ and thus offered sacrificially on the altar;—these with their consequences and accompaniments of idolatrous poses, prostrations, genuflexions and various superstitions characterized the church through the “catholic” ages, as the result of sacerdotalism, until in the slow but sure vital progress of humanity, the Renaissance or New-Birth of the human mind occurred, bringing with it the great Reformation of the sixteenth century.

Do the things above enumerated, and their like, we inquire,—constitute the American ideal of religion? Do they commend themselves to the genius of the American people? Does the word “catholic” which historically represents them blend harmoniously with the word which stands for the vast continent and country wherein

our lot is cast? Let us remember, as we face these questions, that "catholic" and "priest," in the Natural History of Christianity, go together; let us clearly understand that priests are, by derivation and legitimate occupation, sacrificing officials and then let us ask ourselves if we desire to advertise to the religious world that our Ministry is in these days a company of "priests" and that our Protestant character as a church has been so completely changed that it may now be fittingly described as "American Catholic?" If we do desire to so advertise, of course we will do it; but, while we are thinking about it, it may, perhaps, be helpful to recall that it was written of old time, "Those whom the gods destroy they first make mad!"

#### IV.

"WORDS may make *this* way or *that* way," says the cynical critic, speaking of theology and philosophy, and he is more or less encouraged in his sneer by those churchmen who tell us that there are "priests" *and* "priests," and that we must discriminate clearly, if not sharply, between them. This is the refuge of those in the church who, for conscientious reasons, seek to wrest the word "priest" to its own destruction by using it with an unnatural meaning or with a forced and figurative definition. They remind us, by so doing, of something which has been said about keeping a promise to the ear and breaking it to the heart. To claim existence for two sorts of priests is bitterly to disappoint

the originals of the two and—what is of more consequence—is as fatal to lucidity as the advocacy of a double morality, or of more than one sort of catholics. A priest, let us repeat, is a sacrificing official and the discharge of his function requires a propitiatory victim. As such the priest has been a figure in history from time immemorial. His form rises to view in ancient Egypt, in Babylonia, in Assyria, in Israel, in Greece and Rome and in all he may be seen pursuing his intercessory vocation, offering the sacrifices, slaughtering the victims, maintaining the altar fires, removing the ashes, caring for the temple furnishings and so on, in the just and conscientious discharge of duty as a priest. What a clean-cut historic picture he appears! How unequivocally he defines himself! Can we look at him at work and doubt what a priest is? Could such a conspicuous and perfectly outlined official be removed from religion,—as he was removed by Christianity,—and yet his *name* be retained without involving infinite confusion and harm? To call any other kind of functionary a priest in a loose or a figurative way is to incur the protest of common sense—which is the Universal Reason—against the violation, by so doing, of a truth of history.

Figurative language, we pause to observe, has its value but it is not wholly valuable for purposes of definition. It decorates sentences and lends sprightliness to pages, nevertheless it is always in some degree dangerous to use because it is susceptible of being taken literally. Figurative language was largely responsible for transmuting the Lord's Supper into the Eucharistic Sacrifice; the same sort of language also had its share

in providing the concept which developed into Transubstantiation, centuries before that doctrine was defined and made dogmatic in a Council of the Church. Hence, and for other specific reasons, wisdom would seem to advise a certain wariness in the use of figures of speech, or in the double use of adjudicated words, which comes to much the same thing. A priest is a priest and we know what that is; to say he is that and also something quite different is, as it seems to us, unconsciously to play fast and loose with words and make a deplorable mess of many things in many minds. If, indeed, anyone, for his own private purposes, should see fit to declare that a Presbyterian deacon is a "priest" we presume that he would be, for those purposes, privileged to do so; but we fancy the deacon would thereupon repudiate the title, while the rest of the world, if informed, would wonder what under the sun the singular man was talking about. To attribute to any officer in any church a "priestly" character in a poetic or romantic way is in our view to thoroughly misrepresent him. Or, to describe a "priest" as other than a sacrificing official; to define him as an Illuminator of the way of Truth, or as a Leader of the people in the path of spiritual progress, or as an exceptional Advocate and Exemplar of righteousness and service is to evacuate his official character of its distinctive meaning and to hopelessly confound him with the prophet—his antithesis, if not his antagonist, in all respects. We have no moral right, we opine, to promote indefiniteness of speech and induce confusion of mind in a great mass of people by any such romantic or figurative use of language.



But here it is pertinent for someone to remind us that “priest” is mentioned in the Book of Common Prayer. We take the reminder sympathetically, for we, too, have noticed that Priest is in the Prayer Book and we beg to state that, as loyal churchmen, we accept it, *in the sense in which it is therein contained*. We do not take “Priest” in the Prayer Book, literally, nor yet figuratively, but only in a *titular* sense. The name itself, we hardly need say, was an inheritance from the old Service Books of pre-Reformation times and was a word familiar and dear to the people by its long association with some of the most sacred events in their lives. There was fear and trembling in many English hearts in Reformation days—there was genuine apprehension lest the changes being made in religious forms should imperil or impair, in the popular mind, the substance of religion itself. And so, for the sake of soothing those apprehensions and reassuring the people by a familiar sound it was thought best to retain the word “priest,” in spite of grave doctrinal objections to it, seeking, however, to neutralize any misleading influence it might have, by placing it in the Prayer Book in propinquity with another word of clerical signification. For, “Minister” also, we take leave to notice, is in the Book of Common Prayer and the historical atmosphere in which Prayer Book compilation was conducted reveals that “Minister” and “Priest,” in the Prayer Book sense, are synonymous terms, meaning “Pastor” and having no sacerdotal or sacrificial significance whatever. “Priest” appears in the Prayer Book without regard to its antecedents and for the purposes of rubrical instructions, not for the sake of sacerdotal recognition.

The things the titular "Priest" is instructed to do are not priestly performances at all, but are matters of detail for conducting our Protestant Services with Protestant decency and order. To give a "Minister" rubrical direction as to when, or where, he is to stand in church and how he is to arrange things liturgical for his convenience, is not by any means to confer upon him, or to presuppose that he has, sacerdotal character or duty. The "Priest" whom the rubrics direct in the Services might just as well be uniformly designated either Minister, or Presbyter, or Pastor, so far as the mind of this church regarding his official character is concerned. It is the particular thing to be done and not the particularly named functionary who is to do it that the church indicates when in the Prayer Book she uses the word we now have under consideration. To be sure, "Priest" is, in some instances, the accredited title of the man who is to do the given things; but if we are intent upon knowing what that title means we must go, in the first place, not to rubrics or Services, but to the *Ordinal*, or the "Form and Manner of ordering Priests," in our Communion. Therein we may plainly see how a "Priest" is defined in this church, by the light of the *promises* a candidate is called upon to make, previous to, and justifying, his ordination. He makes no promise and receives no authority, to be a sacrificing official offering propitiatory victims; but he pledges himself to instruct out of the Holy Scriptures the people committed to his charge; to give faithful diligence always to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments and the discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded and as this church hath received the same;



to be ready to banish and drive away from the church all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word and to exhort both in public and in private the sick and the well as occasion may be given; to be diligent in Prayers and in reading the Holy Scriptures and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same; to fashion himself and his family according to the doctrine of Christ; to maintain, as much as possible quietness, peace and love among all Christian people and to obey his Bishop and other Ministers who may lawfully have charge and government over him. These are the promises which a candidate for Orders, at the proper time, in our church makes, and thereupon the Bishop who is to ordain him prays that God will give the man strength and power to perform the same and then proceeds to confer upon him authority to execute the office of a Priest in the Church of God in which *he is to be* "a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God and of the Holy Sacraments." Is there anything in those promises and their culmination in ordination which the most tortured ingenuity of the human mind could convincingly twist into a declaration, a hint, a suspicion even, that a "priest" in our church is a sacrificing official offering victims, or is anything less, or more, than a consistent religious teacher of Christianity and a leader and representative of the people in public worship and in matters pertaining to the same? If there is *not*, then we would like to ask what becomes of that solitary phrase in the Office for the "Institution of *Ministers*" (italics our)—solitary in the Prayer Book "as a sparrow alone upon the house top" and yet a phrase so valiantly waved by those of us

who need its inspiration—what, we earnestly desire to ask, becomes of “sacerdotal Function” in view of the utter lack of evidence in the *Ordinal* to justify it or anything like it? Why, its fate might be described by some—not churchmen—as a vanishing into “airy nothing signifying naught;” but we, who *are* churchmen and, as such, loyal to the core, would simply say that it lapses into the purely figurative—exhibits itself as one of those figures of speech against the use of which we have already warned ourselves, because, however alluring, they are dangerous to use on account of the possibility that someone may take them literally. Where there is literally no sacerdotal function in the Ministry, how can any Minister literally possess power to exercise it? “Sacerdotal Function,” for aught we know, may be an euphemism for the saying of Morning and Evening Prayer.

## V.

“PRIEST” in the Prayer Book indicating, as we have seen, a *titular* officer—that is, one inheriting the *title* of priest without the priestly function,—we may expect to find evidence of this, not only in the Ordination Service, which we have examined, but also in the other Prayer Book Services, at one of the most important of which, for our purpose, we now propose to glance. “Sacerdotal Function” we have easily perceived to be a figure of speech, poetizing, amongst other ministerial duties, the saying of Morning and Evening Prayer, in which the titles Priest and Minister sympathetically commingle as they also do in the Order for the Holy Communion.

It would be passing strange if *one* figurative expression in our Service Book should dominate and set aside a multitude of *literal* expressions which, in the same Book, contradict it. That lonesome figure of speech—"sacerdotal function"—must therefore, in reason, be interpreted by the whole character of the rest of the Prayer Book including, of course, the Communion Office.

Now, what is the Holy Communion in the Protestant Episcopal Church? To begin with and on the very face of it, it is not a sacerdotal Rite or Ceremony. The Church distinctly, in the Book of Common Prayer, declares it to be "The Lord's Supper." It is, as we are again instructed by the Church, one of the two only Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself and a sacrament, the Church further says, is an outward and visible *sign* of an inward and spiritual grace given to us, and is one means whereby we receive that spiritual grace and is also a pledge to assure us that we do receive it. The Holy Communion or the Lord's Supper is, therefore, plainly not a sacerdotal Rite—it is not the "mass," nor *a* mass. For, what is the "mass"? The word is of uncertain origin and has been the subject of much disputatious discussion as to that point and other particulars. It may have been derived from its occurrence in Latin at the conclusion of ordinary Church services to indicate that the unbaptized, or "catechumens" were to "go" or depart before the beginning of the Communion Office, or perhaps, it came from the use of the same word after the conclusion of the Holy Communion, bidding the communicants depart in peace; or perhaps

with greater probability, it may have issued from a Hebrew word meaning oblation or offering, originally connected with the sacrifices in the Jewish Church. But, waiving the question of verbal derivation, which is of no great consequence after all, there can be no reasonable doubt that the proper, technical sense expressed by "mass" is that of "offering," involving the idea of sacrifice, which, by Jewish and Pagan associations implied a victim offered by a priest. Long before the Reformation of the sixteenth century this word "mass" had been exclusively employed to mean what we designate as the Holy Communion, and was identified with that sacrificial aspect of the Sacrament which it was the chief endeavor of the Reformers to banish from the Church. In the vigorous controversial language of the Reformation period the "mass" was roughly handled,—one most eminent English Reformer declaring it to be "a very masking and mockery of the true supper of the Lord," and in the thirty-first Article of Religion of the Church of England,—corresponding with the same article of the Protestant Episcopal Church—"the sacrifices of masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priest did offer Christ, for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt," are denounced as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

We hereupon observe that that conception of the Lord's Supper which is known as the "mass" and which is denounced by the Churches of the Anglican Communion, is characterized by the offering on an altar by a priest, of Christ as a sacrifice in order that thereby the living and the dead may have remission of pain or guilt. These are the *notes* of the "mass" and they



necessitate the transubstantiation of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper into the actual Body and Blood of Christ. Of course there is no difficulty in perceiving that this theory of the Lord's Supper requires for its practice a sacrificing priest offering a propitiatory victim. But do we find any such requirement in the "Order for the administration of the Lord's Supper," in our Prayer Book? Let us see. According to that "Order" the Lord's Supper is administered from a "Table," not upon an altar. "The 'Table' at the Communion-time," says the rubric, "having a fair white linen cloth upon it shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel." The Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments having been said by the "*Minister*" and responded to by the congregation; the other parts of the service, including the recital of the Creed and the reception of the Alms and other Devotions of the people, having been duly rendered, the "Priest" (= "*Minister*") is to stand before the "Table" and say the "Prayer of Consecration" of the bread and wine. Thus far in our observation not the slightest indication of a sacerdotal Rite has appeared. No altar, no victim, no sacrifice, no sacrificing priest has been so much as faintly intimated. Still further: if the "Prayer of Consecration" to which, in our examination, we have now come had been deliberately composed as a polemical treatise against the doctrine of priestly sacrifice it could not have been stronger, or clearer, or more pointed that way than it is. Over and over again in this Prayer it is affirmed that the Lord's Supper is a "*memorial*." With studied frequency this fact is brought to view. It is a Service "in *remembrance* of Christ's death and passion." It is

a fulfilling of Christ's commandment "to continue a perpetual *memory* of His precious death and sacrifice." In it we do make with "holy gifts" of offered bread and wine "the *memorial* the Son has commanded us to make." The one "full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction," by Christ, "for the sins of the whole world" is thankfully *remembered* in the Lord's Supper and in that remembrance Christ's commandment is fully recognized and obeyed. There are "offerings" in this Service, but not of victims. There are figurative "sacrifices" made, but not propitiatory. The "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" is therein offered to God, but praise and thanksgiving are not "victims" and cannot, therefore, be sacrificed in any literal or sacerdotal sense. The offering of "ourselves, our souls and bodies" and of "our bounden duty and service" are not offerings of "victims" either, their offering is simply the declaration and performance of a duty to extend our lives Godward, according to the commandments and example of Jesus Christ. All through the Office, the memorial and non-sacrificial view of the Lord's Supper is taken and clearly expressed; the elements in the Supper are called, even *after* the act of consecration, "bread and wine," and any of the consecrated "Bread and Wine" which may *remain* "after the Communion" are to be consumed by the "Minister and other Communicants." There is not, in this Service, the remotest suggestion of the "Mass" or of the doctrinal teachings and assumptions upon which the Catholic Eucharistic Use is based.



Where, then, and by what authority can we locate a priest and his sacrificial work in the Protestant Episcopal Church? Having no recognition in the official standards and no duty assigned him in the worship of this Church the occupation of a priest—excepting a *titular* one—would be, if he existed in our Communion, like that of Othello, gone. By what possible affinity, then, can our church be qualified for “American Catholic” as a name? Catholic, we remember, at once suggests by association, priest and altar and sacrificial masses, and priestly intervention between God and men; while we by right of Protestant inheritance and determination are divested and innocent of all such. What notable thing, then, could we accomplish by displaying “American Catholic” on our escutcheon for the edification of the world? Well, by thus stultifying ourselves we could possibly cleave our church in twain, make a failure of our mission to the people of these United States, constitute our church a laughing stock to Roman Catholics wherever to them we are known and become a religious by-word and a token of reproach to the great Protestant bodies surrounded by which we live. Perhaps, for most of us that would be *too* notable and also just a little too much.

## VI.

JESUS CHRIST founded no Church; but the Church came naturally and necessarily into being as a means for the publication of the Good News which He proclaimed. That News was, that all men are sons of God

and therefore bound by the great ethical law of perfection in living because their Origin, namely, their Father in heaven, is perfect. Knowledge of this, with all that it involves is to be proclaimed, according to the will of Jesus, throughout the world to every human creature. Hence, the necessity for an *institution*—an established gathering of people—whose duty it shall be to preserve and spread abroad the Master's Good News.

In connection with this we notice that in the meeting of the disciples at Pentecost there were distinguished manifestations of gifts of the Holy Spirit in the interest of the proclamation of the Master's Gospel. Therein we perceive the incipient or initiatory institution of the Christian Church. Begun then, its primitive organization was completed later. Being an organization for the practical purpose of preaching the Gospel, the Church contained potentially a ministry of gospel proclamation and a government or order of institutional life. This two-fold function of the leaders and representatives of the church was necessary to the continued existence and the fruitful work of the Christian Institution. There must be preaching and there must be order. Hence, there must be men devoted to preaching and to ordering. Such a ministry, therefore, speedily developed, and the easy and almost casual way in which, seemingly, it came is most noticeable. Like a fruit from a tree, or a flower from a plant the ministry was put forth by the Body of the believers and the simplicity with which it was established was due to its essentialness to the purpose for which the Church existed. The essential in life, we notice, arrives without fuss, while the arbitrary is inducted ceremoniously and with much din.

Now, Christianity, be it remembered, was born, so to speak, in the residence of Judaism and the household belongings of Judaism were round about it. There was the Jewish temple with its sacrificial paraphernalia—its altar, its incense, its holy places, its imposing ceremonies, its atmosphere of awe-creating mystery and its company of priests. There, too, were the synagogues—"the houses of assembling" and of teaching—ancient in origin and to this our day in use amongst the Jews. The synagogue was destitute of altar, sacrifices, incense and holy places; but it contained a pulpit at which the Scriptures were read, religion and morality were expounded, and from which the devotions of the people in the synagogue Service were led. It runs with our purpose in writing this that the reader, the preacher and the leader of devotions were "unconsecrated by any special rites and unrestricted by any rule of succession."

Briefly thus we recall the religious dualism which existed in Judaism at the beginning of, and long before, the Christian era. The Temple and the Synagogue, with all that they implied,—the temple without a pulpit and the synagogue without an altar—composed that duality, dwelling together as they did in peace and harmony and, moreover, in close contact with primitive Christianity, constituting for it an environment most influential for formative purposes.

Now, the dominant men amongst the disciples, namely, the Apostles, when the Christian Church was taking shape, were perfectly familiar, by birth and by habit of life, with both the Temple and the Synagogue and the religious procedures therein. They were well acquainted



with the richness of the Temple ceremonial and its sensuous appeal and also with the severe simplicity of the Synagogue service with its moral and spiritual edification. Life-long education had convinced them of the need of sacrifices for sins and intuitively they must have been aware that their companions in life loved gorgeousness in religious services with oriental fervor. Why then, did the apostles, when they sought a pattern for shaping the Christian Church turn from the ritual superiority of the Temple to the comparative inferiority of the institutes of the Synagogue? For, that was what they did and there could have been but one reason justifying such a course. That reason was in the fact that the apostles knew the transitory and prophetic nature of the Temple Service. Under the influence of Jesus they had come to understand that the sacrificial contents of the Temple were only types and portents of Jesus Christ and His one and only sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. Convinced of that, of what further use was the Temple and its accessories to the apostles, or to the Christian community? The Temple types, having been completely realized, were no longer available for effective employment. They had expended their value and would have been empty and merely intrusive in the organization of the New Religion born in the house of Judaism, but destined to supercede it in the spiritual service of mankind. Priests were no longer necessary. No longer were bleeding victims and smoking altars significant of anything to come. All that *could* come *had* come and the waiting world was already taking deep breath of the new life in Christ and sighing with ecstatic relief. It was a *saved* world out



upon which the apostles looked, their eyes shining with the purpose of eternal life. It was a world no longer in need of sacrifice, but 'twas desperately in need of teaching. It was waiting to be instructed in the truth as it is in Jesus, to be grounded and settled in His revelation and built up in the faith of Him. That form of Christian institution which could best do teaching, would be the one best adapted to work, under the apostolic commission to preach the Gospel. And there, ready to hand as a model, was the Synagogue of God's ancient people, with no color of sacrifice in its composition and no vested priesthood to perpetuate a memory of a vanishing Past. The Christian Church, therefore, soon took shape on the lines of the Synagogue. From some points of view it might seem as if the Church took bodily possession of the Synagogue for its own occupancy. At all events it is true that in officially furnishing the Church, so to speak, the apostles took nothing from the ecclesiastical machinery of the Temple but, on the contrary, introduced much which corresponded remarkably and unmistakably with arrangements in the other Institution.

The governing and ministering body of the Synagogue consisted, we know, of *elders*, some of whom judged the affairs of the congregation, and others officiated publicly as religious ministers. These led the prayers, provided for reading the Scriptures, or Law, and upon occasion preached. They were known, individually, as the "Angel of the Church," or "bishop of the Congregation." This is, obviously, suggestive of the origin of an eminent ecclesiastical title of later days. The "Minister of the Synagogue," as he was also called,

did not himself read the Scriptures publicly, but at every Service he called out of the congregation some of those he considered qualified to read, and then, during the reading stood by, carefully watching or overseeing the reader and correcting him if he made mistakes. Hence, he was "Overseer" or "Episcopos." We also learn of almoners or "deacons" in the synagogue, whose duty it was to care for the poor, and who were called "Pastors" by virtue of their ministrations. That these and other characteristics of the Synagogue adopted by the apostles in instituting the Church, bare mention of which must content us, give evidence that there was no priesthood therein, seems plain enough to the open mind. Not only, however, in the names of the primitive Church office-holders, but in the *numerous* places of religious Service, in the nature of the Services themselves, in the absence of Vestments, in the lack of Ministerial Succession and of an altar, in the pulpit or raised desk for the reader and preacher—in these peculiarities, common as they were to both the Synagogue and the Church, there is ample proof that the public worship of God in the Synagogue, which was moral and not sacrificial, was transferred by the apostles to the spiritual regimen of the Christian Institution. Much more evidence to the same end might easily be adduced if we were writing an extended essay instead of our present endeavor. But even the scanty allusions we have made may quicken memories, and thus illustrate anew the truth that "a word to the wise is sufficient."

Did somebody say that "American Catholic" would be a good name for our Branch of the Church, rooted, as it is, in primitive Christianity and the Protestantism

which restored it in Reformation times? We believe somebody did so say, and the hearing of it makes us wonder if the authors of the proposed name expect to float it with inspiration drawn from the early days of pure Christianity ecclesiastically modelled on the simplicity of the "houses of assembling" or Synagogue of God. If not from that source, then, *whence* will our "American Catholics" derive inspiration to demonstrate the fitness of their name?

## VII.

MAN has been defined as a religious animal, and he may also be described, in a general way, as an ungrateful animal, especially in the higher region of his religious life. Created with a religious instinct which is an essential part of his being and by virtue of which he is naturally religious, he originally exercised this instinct with a very crude and imperfect notion of what it was. In common with all that man had and was, in the beginning, religion was low in its expressions of life. But it was not to remain low. From its early crudities—its deification of natural objects, its fetishes, its dark fears and superstitions, its cruelties and immoralities it was destined to evolve, as the ages rolled along, the highest human qualities and relations, until "in the fulness of the times" it should illumine the world with the splendor of man's spiritual destination. That destination was early indicated by intimations, intuitive and prophetic, of the subordination of the physical and temporal to the spiritual and eternal in life, embracing as it does religion. Passing through



phase after phase of development on its upward way, religion at last brought man to Christianity, or, to speak more accurately, in these technical days, to the religion of Jesus Christ. Therefrom the sun of righteousness shone in full effulgence upon man, revealing to him his divine family origin with its necessary implications, one of which was the spiritual nature of the worship which he must render the Almighty Father in heaven. Because God is a Spirit He must be worshiped by man in spirit and in truth. This is the teaching of Jesus Christ regarding worship. Mankind was slowly led to the fullness of that teaching by numerous preceding and partial school-masters, notable and final amongst which was Judaism. When Judaism could carry man no further towards his destiny it halted on the threshold of Christianity and surrendered its pupil to the waiting Christ. Under His tutelage formal religion, sanctioned by external authority, was clearly perceived to illustrate a mistaken conception of the Divine Father's will. Man had not, indeed, altogether missed this truth all the days of his schooling, although it had lurked and nestled in the shadows cast in times of ignorance at which God is said to have winked. But now there was no blinking the old partially expressed truth which Jesus Christ made whole and new by his full declaration and enforcement of it. God's worship must be in man's *spirit*—his body cannot conceive it. Bodily expressions are no *essential* part of worship. Burnt offerings and sacrifices and offerings for sin God would not—but the human *will* bent before the will of God and the spirit of man soaring to God in adoration and praise constitute the worship which the Father demands, for



which there is no substitute and with which there can be no compromise.

Conditioning this, however, is the fact that *expression* is the imperative mood of human nature, and that therefore man's spirit without power or means of expressing itself would be in evil case in a world of flesh and sense. Hence man *has* power of expression by means of physical instrumentation of his spiritual conceptions and emotions. And so the early Christians, fresh and warm from the Master's teaching, released their heartfelt worship in simple, spontaneous activities, inspired by memories of the precepts and example of their departed Lord.

The material and arrangement of Christian services in the days of the Apostles would, doubtless, be rejected by many modern Christians as esthetically poverty-stricken and liturgically lean. But in the first warm flush of spiritual enthusiasm over the new found and priceless treasure of the gospel, worshipful expression was valued by its earnestness and depth of sincerity, rather than by its ornateness and glitter. We gather the details of Apostolic worship from the New Testament itself. There was prayer and praise and admonition. The gathered disciples taught and admonished each other in all wisdom in Psalms and Hymns, in spiritual songs, singing with gratitude in their hearts to the Lord, giving thanks at all times on account of all things to the God and Father of all. There were supplications and prayers and intercessions for all men; there was reading of the scriptures as a part of the service; there was preaching, or exhortation and instruction addressed to the congregation; there were

formal contributions to the needs of the poorer brethren and there was "the breaking of the Loaf" or the administration of the Lord's Supper. It was all very simple and unpretentious, yet joyous with tuneful tokens of the melody which was ringing in grateful hearts. The services thus alluded to were some of them—probably not many—held in Jewish Synagogues whose congregations had probably in a body been converted to Christianity. There were other meeting places—upper chambers or worship rooms; later, specially constructed buildings before the times when basilicas, those splendid public halls where Roman Justice took her seat, were by favor of Christian Emperors occupied for Church Services. Upon these and the like things we need not dwell. Exteriors did not count for much with the disciples in those days, for the interior life of the Church was so illumined and glorified by the Good-News of Jesus, that mere buildings, together with the ceremonies performed therein, were matters of entirely secondary importance, and inferior interest.

But this was not so for long. Soon the shadows of coming changes were casting themselves before. The pristine simplicity of "the sweet Gallilean dream" come true in the hearts and lives of men, began to be blurred and confused with memories issuing from the religious life which had gone before. Amongst the Jewish converts arose Judaizing teachers mingling the elements of the Law with the truth of the Gospel. These strove to restore the principles, and in modified application, the practices of the ancient Jewish religion. Defeated, generally, in their purpose, they succeeded to some extent, and bye-and-bye they succeeded some more. Old

habits are difficult to extirpate. Long accepted principles, even after rejection, have wondrous recuperative power. The peace of early Christianity was disturbed because these things were so, and aided anon by pagan influences a covert revolution worked, and gradually the old ideas and the old words came into new use, and "priest," "altar," "sacrifice" were again—and this time in Christianity—on the lips and influencing the lives of men.

The claim that this condition of things was the natural result of a legitimate process of development, dissolves in the recollection that development in Christendom is of two kinds, namely, a biological and an ecclesiastical, the last mentioned being false and the other natural and true. A biological development is from within; it is a growth or unfolding from a germ of true, though hidden life, and must, therefore, be in the Church in accordance with the Master's will and intention. Contrariwise, an ecclesiastical development is from without—it is an accretion—something stuck on externally—it clings barnacle-like to the surface of the Christian Institution, impeding its progress, to its haven across the waves of this troublous world. Of this latter, or false, sort of development was the recrudescence of sacerdotalism in religion when it appeared in Christianity. It was reactionary. It was a facing away from the new illumination of Truth and Love towards the shadowy background against which that Light of the world was gloriously displayed. It meant a rejection of the liberty where-with Christ had made men free—for a return to the bondage from which they had been delivered. It meant a lot of



things derogatory to man, but deepest and most of all, when traced to its roots, it meant that man was *ungrateful* in the higher region of his religious life. Ungrateful he certainly seems to have been for some of the richest blessings vouchsafed him in early Christianity pure and true; freedom from the law, from propitiary sacrifice, from priestly intervention, and we cannot repress the suspicion that he must have been ungrateful for every lift—every upward movement—in the progress of religion from the beginning of his earthly career. History seems in very many instances to justify our suspicion and to make us uncertain whether the sins of the fathers will be interminably repeated by the children in the matter of ungrateful hearts.

Are we prepared to perpetuate in our day and generation the basest of all sins, ingratitude, and in the highest region of our life? Are we so unappreciative of our Protestant Christian heritage—do we hold it so lightly—that we will ever consent to call ourselves “American Catholics” and then become such in spirit and in truth?

*“He that’s ungrateful has no guilt but one,  
All other crimes may pass for virtues in him.”*

## VIII.

WE have endeavored in these pages to present *impressions* produced upon our mind by various important phases of history and a number of plain facts in our Prayer Book which seem to bear upon the proposal to substitute “American Catholic” for the name of the



Protestant Episcopal Church. In so doing we have not entered upon a controversy, nor have we engaged in a discussion; for it seems to us doubtful if controversy ever really converted anybody, and discussion, while interesting in a way, proves oftentimes, eventually, a weariness to the soul. But "impressions" are more easily carried and make smaller demands upon sustained critical attention. They are quite a fashion of our time, too,—with painters and sculptors and writers, also, they have vogue, and with such they seem to lend themselves to rather satisfactory results, at any rate in the opinions of many. And so, we have been giving "impressions," religious and ecclesiastical, and we were impressed as we passed along, with the *ingratitude* of man especially in the higher region of his religious life.

Ingratitude was a sin conspicuously seen, we thought, in the reaction amongst the early Christians from pure Christianity to priesthood and propitiary sacrifices, which were characteristics of Judaism and Paganism. From regarding God as a Sovereign and a dread Judge to be appeased, approachable only through a long avenue of sacerdotal representatives, men were led by His Son Christ to regard God as the beneficent Father, close at hand, directly accessible, easy to be entreated and constantly ready to bless and comfort with His love and favor. Men had been set free from the inferior bindings of religion and yet so unappreciative of their spiritual freedom did they soon become, that they ungratefully turned back to bondage and made as nought the wonderful deliverance achieved for them by Jesus Christ. It seems to us as we reflect, a case of ingratitude, and ingratitude, we fancy, runs characteristically,

like a black thread, through all the pages of religious history.

Now, ingratitude appears as a matter of necessity to issue in disloyalty. To be ungrateful for benefits seems inevitably to involve disloyalty to the source or the ideals of given benefactions. The Christian ideal of life is a spiritually *safe* life, built on belief and trust in the unfailing love of God as revealed in Jesus Christ. The upbuilding of that life is to be, and must be, **an individual human achievement**. No man and no number of men can possibly build for any other man, or number of men, a safe spiritual life. Every man, according to the principles, or ideals, of Christianity is to “build *himself* up”—is to “work out his *own* salvation,” which means possession of a character, safe to possess at any time, in any world. To this end God works *with* men, inspiring them by His Spirit, leading them, directing them, as they work on themselves, to His glory which is their own best being. Hence, for men to vacate this high privilege and duty in favor of a body of priests, who are merely other men after all; to accept from those other men the offering of propitiatory sacrifices and all, or any, of the complicated religious externalities of times before Christ, was upon the part of certain early Christians, if we see straight, an exhibition of ingratitude embodied in *disloyalty* to the ideals of religious life, uplifted for our guidance heavenward by the Son of Man.

Later on in the history of Christianity the same sort of thing may be observed. Priestcraft and all that goes therewith having obtained residence in the Church, by the unconscious disloyalty of those early

Christians, held its place for centuries until the great awakening of the spirit of primitive Christianity in the Reformation—which event is pleasantly referred to by some enthusiastic “American Catholics” as “the catastrophe of the sixteenth century!” The heroic struggles made for liberty in Christ at that strenuous period of the Church’s life; the martyrs’ blood so freely shed; the fires that so fiercely burned at Smithfield and at Oxford; the matchless courage for the truth then displayed, need not to be recounted here,—the memory of those deeds and days lives now in countless hearts as having won in England’s realm the inheritance of our own dear Church in this free land, the blessings of Protestant Christianity which we cherish and defend. But history repeats itself in what looks to us very like ingratitude and disloyalty to-day, and Reformation battles seem likely, in our generation, and later, to be fought again. It is lacking in “breadth” to be grateful for divine blessings—is it not? It is “narrow” to be loyal—is it not? It is “intolerant”—is it? or is it not?—to resist attempted destruction,—to resent the caressing hand upon one’s shoulder, so to speak, when the fellow-hand is seen to hold threateningly the gleaming knife all ready, just underneath one’s rib number five! These are general questions, impersonally addressed, but answers volunteered to them may indicate one’s attitude towards the preservation of the truth “as this Church hath received the same.” Every clergyman ministering in “this Church” is so doing upon testimony of his loyalty to the doctrine, discipline and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Do “masses” constitute a part of that



worship? Are auricular confession and penance a part of that discipline? Are the Immaculate Conception and Mariolatry included in that doctrine? Is there any legitimate or essential difference between our teaching and liturgical practices and those of the Roman Catholic Church? There are clergymen officiating in our chancels who apparently do not clearly recognize such differences. They name and conduct services, they wear vestments and adopt attitudes and poses which unmistakably suggest a religious world other than Protestant. They advertise and, presumably, they offer "masses," high, low and requiem—of what other varieties, if any, we are not informed. If "Mass" were merely another and a synonymous name for the Lord's Supper, even then the use of it would be confusing and unwarranted. But as it stands for something doctrinally quite different from and opposed to our doctrine of the Lord's Supper—namely, a propitiatory sacrifice—to use it in our Church involves, as it seems to us, disloyalty to our well known Protestant standards to which we are solemnly pledged. The clergymen who do this and other such things ecclesiastical in our Church are most active in agitation for the adoption of "American Catholic" in lieu of the name we have borne so long. It is, therefore, a short and easy inference from the proposal to change our name, to the principles and practices which lie behind the offered name and give distinctive color and intention to the proposal. To name us and then to make us "catholic" seems to be the plan. Does anybody imagine that the out-carrying of such a plan would commend us to the confidence and admiration of the American people?



How much we have already lost in the regard of the people in this land by the growing sacerdotalism, which, during fifty years last past, has assumed to represent us, no man can with anything like precision, begin to tell. We venture, however, the tentative opinion, that had it not been for that sacerdotal growth and misrepresentation, two million communicants instead of about one million would be recorded to the credit of the Protestant Episcopal Church to-day.

That name for us, after all is said, is ideally descriptive. It is peculiarly felicitous because it is so accurate a reflection of our Churchly character. We are not Roman Episcopal, nor Greek Episcopal, but Protestant Episcopal. Were we named merely the Protestant Church, the name would be meaningless in a land full of other Protestants. Had we been christened the Episcopal Church, we should be, as Professor Nash said, "standing on one leg," and our course would, in consequence, be irregular and halting. But the combination of Protestant and Episcopal so happily presents the doctrinal and the governmental characteristics which distinguish us, that the greatest difficulty has long been experienced in attempting a better or even another one. Our last impression is, that we will surely be loyal to this name,—we surely will if we know in this, our day, the things which will make with us for prosperity and peace.

As for "American Catholic" we dismiss it with grave regard to the limbo of a multitude of forgotten follies.





